

REMARKS

Claims 29-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al, US 6,078,892 in view of Griggs, "Give us leads! Give us leads!".

Claim 29 is directed to a method for processing customer leads that includes configuring a lead processing system. Anderson taken separately or in combination with Griggs neither describes nor suggests receiving feedback from at least one of the users, the feedback indicating whether the lead, should be accepted, rejected or forwarded to another one of the plurality of users, and re-routing the at least one customer lead, based on the plurality of rules and the received feedback from the at least one of the plurality of users to the another one of the users.

The references taken in any combination are not understood to disclose or to suggest at least the foregoing features of the amended claim 29.

Anderson appears silent in regards to "re-routing the at least one customer lead, based on the plurality of rules and the received feedback from the at least one of the plurality of users to the another one of the users." Rather, Anderson is understood to describe a method for retrieving customer lead information from a marketing database (col. 2, lines 42-46). When a match is detected between the parameters and the lead information, the information is output to the user (col. 8, lines 26-48). Nowhere does Anderson describe or suggest "re-routing the at least one customer lead, based on the plurality of rules and the received feedback from the at least one of the plurality of users."

In contrast, in the subject application, leads are routed through a lead processing system in accordance with rules, and the leads are re-routed based upon the rules and feedback from one of the users. Even if a lead has already been delegated to a user, the lead processing system will re-route the lead to another user based on feedback from the first user. Accordingly, Anderson fails at least to disclose or to suggest each and every limitation of amended independent claim 29.

Griggs is not understood to remedy the forgoing deficiencies of Anderson. For example, Griggs is not understood to disclose or to suggest "re-routing the at least one customer lead,

based on the plurality of rules and the received feedback from the at least one of the plurality of users.”

Griggs describes an automated lead-management system that tracks leads from inception to close. In this regards, Griggs reads:

A year ago the \$150 million company implemented a comprehensive, automated lead-management system that allows it to track leads from inception to close. But in order to meet its goal of 50 percent revenue growth per year, Macromedia is taking lead management much further. Using a lead-tracking software program developed by Aurum software in Santa Clara, California, Macromedia gathers all lead sources into one place, then offers an umbrella view of how and where the lead fits in with the prospective customer. With automated scripts and questionnaires, the leads are then qualified by phone, fax, or on the internet. Based on this information, the system assigns each lead a “grade” and priority status, then directs it to the appropriate salesperson or channel partner. (page 2, paragraph 7)

It further reads:

But the process is far from over. The software program continues to track the leads in order to create revenue and manufacturing forecasts. When a sale is closed, it brings the client's order history back into the lead-management system to use as a basis for ongoing service and account management and to provide statistical reports that allow marketing to evaluate return on investment for its different lead-generation programs. (pages 2-3, paragraph 8)

Thus, Griggs' system grades the leads, directs the leads to appropriate sales persons, and continues tracking the leads for the creation of revenue and manufacturing forecasts. Nowhere however does Griggs disclose or suggest “re-routing the at least one customer lead, based on the plurality of rules and the received feedback from the at least one of the plurality of users.”

For at least this reason, amended independent claim 29 is believed to be patentable over the cited references individually or in combination. Amended independent claim 39 includes limitations that are similar to those described above with respect to claim 29 and is also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons noted above.

The dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons discussed in their respective independent claims. Although it is believed that the dependent claims define patentably distinct features, given the distinctiveness of the respective independent claims, the dependent claims are not discussed here in detail.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the entire application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.


Applicants' attorney can be reached at the address shown below. Telephone calls regarding this application should be directed to 617-368-2191.

The required amount of \$225 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply all charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 10235-047001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

20 July 2007



Jeffrey J. Barclay
Reg. No. 48,950

Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906